

not? Because the protest has come largely from non-Jews.

If the Jews can control the movies to the extent the rabbi claimed, why cannot they control them for decency—why do not they control them for decency?

The one weakness of the rabbi's statement is the charge that the Jewish religion was traduced. It would be most interesting to learn how this was done, and by whom. It is a religion which does not easily lend itself to that sort of treatment, picturesque as some of its forms may appear to alien eyes.

There is, however, a meaning hidden in this statement of the rabbi. The Jew considers any public expression of Christian character as being derogatory to his religion. For example: if the President of the United States or the governor of your state should make a specifically Christian allusion in his Thanksgiving Proclamation, or mention the name of Christ, that act would be protested as offensive to Jewish sensitiveness. Not only would be done, but has been done.

In the same hearing referred to, quotation was made from a letter written by Carl H. Pierce, special representative of the Oliver Morosco Photoplay Company, to the executive secretary of the Motion Picture Board of Trade, in which the following statement appeared:

"You and I have seen boards turn down such plays as the 'Life of the Savior' because they thought it might offend the Hebrews."

It is apparent that "Jewish sensitiveness" is a spoiled child which has been unduly coddled and that it has interfered to such an extent that the real question becomes one of non-Jewish rights.

The Jewish defenders have been asking, Why should a nation of 110,000,000 people be considered in danger from 3,000,000 Jews? And "Gentile fronts," with all the zest of a new idea, have shouted the same challenging question.

It might be advantageous to answer thus: Why should a country of 110,000,000 people, mostly of Christian faith and practice, be prevented from seeing the "Life of the Savior" portrayed on the screen because it is feared to offend the Jews?

The answer in both cases is not a comparison of numbers, but a recognition of the fact that, as in the motion picture world the Jews are at the neck of the bottle where they can absolutely control what goes to the public, so they are in other fields at corresponding places of control.

But whether the Jewish producer is qualified to do better than he is doing is a question. When you consider the conditions from which many of them sprang, you will be rendered rather hopeless of voluntary reform.

Why were not "Way Down East" and "The Shepherd of the Hills" put on the screen by Jews? Because the Jews in control of the movies have no knowledge of American rural life, and therefore no feeling for it. The Jew is a product of city life, and that peculiar phase of city life which is found in the ghetto. He sees in a farmer only a "hick" and a "rube." You may rest entirely assured that it was not the Yankee, himself a product of the farms, who turned the agriculturist into a joke, until today the joke has emptied our farms of men. The theatrical "hick" and "rube" of the gold-brick story and the hayseed play, were of Jewish origin. The Jew is a product of city life, and of that phase of city life where the "wits" play a large part. The America of the average Jew who caters to the entertainment of Americans is comprehended in a beaten path from the box-office, to back-stage, and thence to an eating place. He doesn't know America as yet, except as a huge aphid which he may milk.

The Peculiar Racial Bent of the Movies

IT FOLLOWS, therefore, that in all probability he is equally ignorant of American home life. He has not as yet been able to understand what American domesticity means. The American home is an almost unknown quantity to foreigners of the eastern races. An Armenian woman who has lived in America for five years says that she knows nothing of an American home save what she can see through the windows as she passes. This, of course, is a lack not easily to be bridged over. It may not be strictly true that the majority of movie producers do not know the interiors of American homes, but there is certainly every indication that they have not caught its spirit, and that their misrepresentation of it is more than a false picture, it is also a most dangerous influence.

It is dangerous to foreigners who gain their most impressive ideas of American life from the stage. It is dangerous to Americans who fancy that the life of the screen is the life that is lived by "the better classes." If we could map the community mind of whole sections of our cities, and trace the impressions of American people, American habits and American standards which those mind-groups hold, we should then see the

dangerous misrepresentation which movie producers have given to things American. Falsity, artificiality, criminality and jazz are the keynotes of the mass of screen productions.

American life is bare and meager to the eastern mind. It is not sensuous enough. It is devoid of intrigue. Its women of the homes do not play continuously and hysterically on the sex motif. It is a life made good and durable by interior qualities of faith and quietness—and these, of course, are ennui and death to the Orientally minded.

There lies the whole secret of the movies' moral failure: they are not American and their producers are racially unqualified to reproduce the American atmosphere. An influence which is racially, morally and idealistically foreign to America, has been given the powerful projecting force of the motion picture business, and the consequences are what we see.

The purpose of this and succeeding articles is not to lift hands in horror and point out how rotten the movies are. Everybody is doing that. The case against the movies is not contested at all. It is unanimous. Women's clubs, teachers, newspaper editors, police officers, judges of the courts, ministers of religion, physicians, mothers and fathers—everybody knows just what the movies are.

What all these disgusted groups evidently do not know is this: their protests will be entirely useless until they realize that behind the movies there is another group of definite moral and racial complexion to whom the protest of non-Jews amounts to next to nothing at all, if they can possibly circumvent it.

As the rabbi previously quoted showed, the Jews got what they wanted from the producers as soon as they made their request.

What have the 'non-Jewish teachers, women's clubs, newspaper editors, police officers and judges, ministers of religion, physicians, and just plain parents of the rising generation—what have they obtained for all their complaints and protests?

Nothing!

And they can go on beating the air for a lifetime and still obtain no improvement, unless they face the unpleasant racial fact that the movies are Jewish. It is not a question of morals—that question has been settled; it is a question of management.

When the people know *who* and *what* is this intangible influence we call the "movies," the problem may not appear so baffling.

A book containing 236 pages of the first twenty articles on *The International Jew* will be sent to any address, upon receipt of 25 cents in stamps to cover printing and mailing cost.

A resolution introduced by Senator Smoot and adopted by unanimous consent, in the United States Senate the other day, calls upon the War Department to furnish that body with full information concerning credit extended by this country to Poland. Mr. Smoot declined to comment on the purpose of the proposed inquiry. As fairly reflective of the attitude of the Jewish press in the matter, the following is quoted from the *Chicago Israelite*: "It is to be hoped that no further credit will be given to Poland, or any other of the newly created states until they give satisfactory proof of their intention to comply with the terms of the treaties which called them into existence and protect minorities from massacre." Apparently the proof must be "satisfactory," not merely to the governments of the Allies and Associated Powers, but also or rather first of all, to the Jewish financial powers.

Among the three new justices of the supreme court of the state of New York recently formally inaugurated is the Jew, Isador Wasservogel. These judges are elected for a term of fourteen years and each receives a salary of \$17,500 a year.

The Jewish propaganda play woven about the character of Haym Salomon, a Philadelphia Jew, having fallen flat, the Jews have brought into the limelight Maurice Salomon, lineal descendant. This young man is out in a protest, in the *New York World*, against the movement for the restoration of the Christian Sabbath. "It is repulsive to me as an American, to think that the country that my ancestors fought and died for and the country that I bled for is sectarian." He concludes with this particularly "Semitic" suggestion: "I think that men of the Christian type and character that tend to raise the question that this is a Christian country from the standpoint of religion are as poisonous to our country as the Bolsheviks, are as detrimental to our country as any alien who comes here and preaches sedition, and are even more detrimental to our country than the viper who interfered with the draft."

"Let Others Lead" is the heading in a Jewish paper on an article dealing with the attacks by a Jewish assemblyman in New York and the Jewish Sabbath Observance Society of that city on the movement of certain Christian churches to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest. The editor goes on to ask, "Why should we strongly oppose this movement as Jews? This is a question to settle as Americans. It is clearly counter to the First Amendment to the Constitution, in seeking to abridge religious liberty, and Senator Smoot, of Utah, has expressed his willingness to lead the opposition in the Senate. The League for the Preservation of Sunday Recreation is well fitted to bear the brunt of this struggle, and the Freethinkers Society of New York will raise the religious issue."

Jewish World Notes

Let others lead in this fight. If we are so unwise as to step in front, the anti-Semite will say that Jews are interested because they control so many movies, and our concern is wholly commercial. To prevent this half-truth, let other forces accept the leadership."

Maurice Ruben, a Pittsburgh Jew, is thus quoted in the *Pittsburgh Dispatch*: "While in Detroit we made special inquiry regarding the series of articles which have now been published in pamphlet form. We believe that the articles have been misrepresented and misunderstood by the press at large, and undue sentiment was made by the cry of 'Anti-Semitism.'"

Gilbert K. Chesterton, the famous British author who is now lecturing in America, is one of those men who are called "anti-Semites" because they see the mountain of Jewish facts which exist in the world. The list of "anti-Semites," who are not that at all, but who have not been cowed by organized Jewish pressure, is quite a distinguished one.

Rabbi Israel Goldfarb declared at a meeting in Brooklyn that the Jew should be different in every respect from the non-Jew, according to a report in the *Brooklyn Eagle*. "If we mingle freely and assimilate with the non-Jews, Judaism will be lost," he said.

Jewish Bolshevik propagandists have been caught working in Japan.

Says Samuel Bromberg, D. D. S., in the *Chicago Israelite*: "The Jewish young man does not marry a Gentile girl . . . The Jewish young man or young woman may philander around in Gentile circles and come back to the home fold and boast of it as a conquest, but it is only a case of forbidden fruit tasting sweetest. When the time comes for mating, he or she knows where to choose. Like attracts like; water seeks its own level." Christian girls may be interested to know about these Jewish philanderers.

So intense is the anti-Jewish feeling becoming in France in consequence of the exposure of outrageous cases of profiteering, especially in food supplies, that a group of students recently succeeded in preventing the production of a play by the Jewish author, Bernstein, at the Comédie Française.

Despite the persistent shouts of "anti-Semitism" in Jugo-Slavia, a Jew, Dr. Pops, was recently elected vice mayor of Belgrade, the capital city of the kingdom.

Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee, in the *Chicago Sentinel*, heartily commends the suggestion of Oscar S. Straus to the President-elect "that a Jew be sent as ambassador to Germany." This on the ground that such an appointment "would be a crushing blow to anti-Semitism." What weirdly inconsequent views our Jewish leaders seem to entertain as to the delicate nature and functions of diplomatic relations between friendly nations—and of course there are no diplomatic relations between unfriendly nations.

The new cabinet privately made defense against the statements being made about the international Jews, is this: "The statements are dangerous, not because they are lies, but because they are half-truths, and by the time we are done admitting the half that is true, we have spoiled the chance of denying the half that is untrue." But why not begin at the half which is untrue? Even that would be better than the inane "tain't so" that has marked Jewish defense so far.

Jewish residents of Brooklyn, New York, are raising an initial fund of \$100,000 to build a Hebrew school in the eastern district of that borough.

The Jewish papers are reminding us that Mary Garden's notable musical career was made possible by the generosity of Mr. and Mrs. David Mayer, of Chicago, who befriended her when she was a poor Scotch girl and sent her abroad for her musical education at a cost to them of some \$20,000. The story is an old one, and it is never told by the Jews without the recital of its epilogue as an instance of gross ingratitude on the part of a Goy genius, Mary Garden, after she attained success and fame, publicly snubbing her benefactress, Mrs. Mayer. What the Jews do not tell is that the singer religiously paid back all the money that the Mayers had advanced with interest and with keen appreciation of a kindness that was probably not entirely disconnected with assurance that her voice was a good investment. The snub was administered as a last desperate measure of self-defense against a persistent circulation of the story of her indebtedness and constant attempts by the Mayers to parade their ownership of the prima donna, making themselves an insufferable pest. Mary Garden's recent appointment as director-general of the Chicago Grand Opera Company, and a desire to block her success in that post by an attempt to hurt and humiliate her, probably accounts for the present revival of the old bit of ill-natured gossip.

Isadore Luckstone is regarded as one of the foremost opera coaches in America. Myrtle Moses, contralto, of the Chicago Opera Company, who died recently, was the wife of Samuel G. Alschuler, who has given a handsome donation for the extension concerts of the Musicians' Club of Women in her memory.